



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

**by R Hitchcock BSc(Hons) DipCD MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 02 December 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/D/21/3283550**

**45 Lyndhurst Avenue, Irlam, Manchester M44 6HS**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mrs Elizabeth McKenna against the decision of Salford City Council.
  - The application Ref 21/77448/HH, dated 13 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2021.
  - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension, ground floor garage and first floor bathroom and bedroom extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
  - The character and appearance of the locality
  - Highway safety

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The site consists of an extended 2-storey, semi-detached dwelling set behind a short enclosed front garden with private amenity space provided to the rear of the house. The building is separated from the neighbouring dwelling at 43 Lyndhurst Avenue by side driveways in the respective plots. A single storey extension lies to the side of No43.
4. The locality is characterised by rows of consistently designed and spaced pairs of semis with hipped tile roofs and brick elevations set along strong building lines. Although various examples of extensions to the front, rear and sides of buildings are visible, the common height, styling and materials of the buildings result in a strong identity and coherent character to the locality.
5. The 2-storey addition would extend the existing building close to the common boundary with No43. The front and rear elevations would align with the corresponding original main elevations and a new side gable formed to support an extended roof with ridge and eaves lines continuous with the current roof.
6. The flush alignment with the existing main elevations and continuous front roof plane would remove visual references to the original proportions of the building. Despite adding only a modest width to the building's footprint, the

resultant dwelling would appear much wider than the regular form of the existing houses.

7. The roof extension would introduce a form that would be visually at odds with the consistent hips of the original buildings. The ridge of the dwelling would be greater than twice the existing ridge line and the large additional roof area would create significant sense of bulk. Taken with the increased and continuous width of the front elevation, this would cause the building to have excessive massing compared to other development in the locality.
8. In support of the proposed roof form, the appellant draws my attention to the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 which permits the formation of a gabled roof from an existing hipped roof. However, there are few examples of such extensions on Lyndhurst Avenue and there is little before me to indicate that such a development is any greater than a theoretical possibility. Accordingly, I find the fallback position of creating a more limited roof extension to the existing building attracts limited weight in the particular circumstances of the case.
9. The absence of relief between the front face of the extension and principal elevation of the building would remove much of the sense of space between the consecutive buildings. This would interrupt the rhythm of the regular spacing of buildings. Furthermore, it would undermine any sense of symmetry across the form of the semi-pair which would be particularly notable on the approach along the link length of Lyndhurst Avenue where the pair form the closing vista.
10. Whilst it is not necessarily the case that extensions must replicate what is already there, the resultant form of the building would sharply contrast in scale and form to the largely consistent buildings found along Lyndhurst Avenue. If repeated on consecutive plots, either adjoining or detached, the appearance would be one of terrace proportions rather than the regular pattern of semi-pairs.
11. At my site visit I saw that other 2-storey side extensions are present in the locality. However, these utilise a set-back from the main elevation in part, if not all, to retain a focus on the original parts and proportions of those buildings. This is assisted by their secondary roof forms which are set back from the original plane of the front roof slopes and have subordinate ridgelines.
12. I acknowledge that the dwelling at No43 has recently been extended such that a 2-storey side extension may not be constructed there in the near future. However, this is a matter outside of the appellant's control. A repeated addition to the adjoining property at 49 Lyndhurst Avenue would also cause the pair to appear as a building of terraced proportions.
13. According to the appellant the layout of the building is restrictive in relation to achieving the desired arrangement of additional accommodation. However, as demonstrated by other forms of extension along the road, the proposal would not be the only opportunity to extend living accommodation at the site. I am not therefore persuaded that this argument constitutes a good reason for permitting a form of development that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

14. The proposal would cause the dwelling to contrast to the consistent form and spacing of buildings in the locality. It would conflict with Policies DES1 and DES8 of the City of Salford Unitary Development Plan 2004-2016 [June 2006] and advice in the Salford City Council Supplementary Planning Document – House Extensions [July 2006] (SPD) relating to 2-storey side extensions as they seek proposals to respect the positive character of the area. Although these policies pre-date the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), they remain consistent with its aims to secure good design, to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character and maintains a strong sense of place.

#### *Highway safety*

15. No45 has a previous front extension which aligns with the side elevation of the dwelling. According to the appellant, the usable width of the side driveway is some 2.19m, accounting for the position of waste pipes. This dimension is not disputed by the Council but is below its adopted width standard of 2.4m.
16. I have little doubt that the limited width of the driveway and projecting front extension would frustrate the use of the existing hardstanding for parking anything other than small vehicles. The reduction in length of the driveway is therefore unlikely to change the usability of the drive.
17. As the proposal does not include the formation of an additional bedroom, the burden on on-street parking is unlikely to significantly change. At the time of my site visit, albeit a limited snapshot in time, some parking pressure was visible along the main approach from Silver Street, however, the link arm of Lyndhurst Avenue was relatively free of parked vehicles. I also saw that several of the nearby properties had additional parking provision within their plots such that pressure for on-street parking was lower than elsewhere on the loop road.
18. In the absence of substantive evidence to demonstrate a likely adverse effect arising from on-street parking, it is my view that the proposal is unlikely to cause significant increased risk to highway safety in the vicinity of the site. Although the proposal would conflict with the SPD, I find it would preserve highway safety in the interests of creating safe, inclusive and accessible places as required by the Framework.

#### **Conclusion**

19. Notwithstanding my finding in favour of the appellant with regard to matters of highway safety, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the locality. For the reasons given, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*R Hitchcock*

INSPECTOR